



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/522,510	03/10/2000	Youfeng Wu	884.258US1 5136	
21186 7	7590 11/26/2003		EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.			WOOD, WILLIAM H	
P.O. BOX 293 MINNEAPOL	. BOX 2938 NNEAPOLIS, MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2124	9
			DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003	/

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•		CRG				
16 Ja		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
.	Advisory Action	09/522,510	WU, YOUFENG				
•	•	Examiner	Art Unit				
76-	THE SATE SEALS	William H. Wood	2124				
	MAILING DATE of this communication appe		·				
FHE REPLY FILED 14 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) 🔲 they	(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
	(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5.⊠ The a)☐ applicat	5.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
	6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
	7.☑ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☑ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s	Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s	Claim(s) rejected: <u>3-32</u> .						
Claim(s	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The draw	wing correction filed on is a)☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. Note the	attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	. <u> </u> .				
10. Other:							

PRIMARY EXAMINER



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Rejection under 112 is withdrawn. Rejections under 102 and 103 are maintained. Applicant argues Muller is nonanalogous art. This is not the case, as Muller was cited for a specific general teaching (hashing and keys) which applies to Muller and to the claimed invention (networking concerns are not an issue of the rejection). Applicant argues the limitation "instrumenting the software to sample a location-value every S occurrences of the canidate load instruction" (claim 16) is not disclosed. This is untrue. Applicant focuses on only the Computing reference. However, the rejection is obvious in consideration of Conners, Roediger, Calder and Computing, all being required for the teaching. Applicant asserts Computing is an improper combintaion (claim 16). A proper statement of obviousness was given on page 14, line 5. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would be properly equiped to implement sampling. Applicant argues the limitation "selecting a reuse region as a function of the probability of top set-values" (claim 23) was not disclosed. Once again, the entire combination must be considered as stated in the previous rejection, Conners and Calder. Additionally, Application indicates confussion on the rejection of claim 29. As stated in the previous rejection (page 12 and 15), claim 29 is rejected in a similar manner as claim 16. Claim 29, will now be placed in rejection under claim 27. These are believed to be the points of concern on Applicant's part and having been addressed the claims 3-32 are rejected.

2